

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-2, 4, 10-18, 21-28 and 37-38 and 40-41 remain pending in the application.

### **Non-Compliance with 35 U.S.C. 121**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 1-2, 4, 10-18, 21-28, and 37-41 remain pending.

### ***Claims 1, 2, 18, 22, 27 and 28***

In the May 28, 2006 Response to the Advisory Action of May 22, 2006, Applicant inadvertently copied an earlier claim set into the Response, rather than the claim set as it had been amended up to that time. As a result, the original version claims 1, 2, 18, 22, 27 and 28, were included in the response and designated "Original" even though these claims had been amended. The claims enclosed herewith reflect the wording of the claims as amended, and are designated by the proper designation, "Previously Presented." Applicant apologizes for any confusion that resulted from this inadvertence.

### ***Identification of Newly Added Claims***

Claims 37, 38, 39, 40 and 41 were added to the application on March 20, 2006, but applicant failed to designate the species of these newly added claims. Applicant was properly advised of this in the Advisory Action mailed May 22, 2006. Applicant herein identifies newly added claims 37-38 and 40-41 as falling within Species I of the Restriction of August 29, 2006, thereby placing these claims in position for examination and allowance. Newly added claim 39 does not fall within the Elect Species, but depends from generic base claim 37. Applicant invites the Examiner to withdraw newly added claim 39, pending the allowance of a generic base claim.

Applicant understands from Examiner's remarks in paragraph 2 of the Notice of Non-Compliance of August 23, 2006 that Applicant's March 20, 2006 response should have retained the designation "New" for these claims. The foregoing claim listing reflects this status. Applicant further understands by this requirement that addition of a semicolon at the end of element (a), claim 37 was improper as claim 37 had not been entered as "New," and that this amendment was not entered. Applicant has removed the semicolon. Applicant

further understands by Examiner's comments that the designation of "Withdrawn" for claim 39 in Applicant's March 20, 2006 response was improper before it had been properly entered as "New."


***Conclusion***

Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. If a telephone interview would be helpful in any way, the examiner is invited to call the applicant at the phone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted

Dated: 09-22-06

By:

  
Shelly Lenna Bauerly  
310-985-0407